

~~RESTRICTED~~

25 October 1950

MEMORANDUM FOR: Executive

Document No.	06
No Change In Class.	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Declassified	
Class. Changed to:	TS C
Next Review Date	1989
Auth:	HR 70-3
Date	25 JAN 1979
By:	52

In compliance with your request, the following notes are submitted with regard to memorandum from the AD/PC dated 24 October:

The Adjutant General has become, in effect, the record-keeper and publisher of the Army. He has very little actual final power, except in connection with the Army Postal Service.

The Army General, Special and Technical Staffs either determine or recommend policy and issue directives either directly or through the Adjutant General. These Staffs operate directly under a Chief of Staff and his deputies.

The only real analogy between the Adjutant General and the Executive, CIA, is in the matter of signing official papers. The actual Adjutant General function in this Agency is performed in several places:

- a. OCD - Record-keeping, receipt and dissemination of papers and postal service.
- b. Services Division, Administrative Staff (Exec) - Publishing.
- c. Personnel Divisions (Exec) - Personnel matters in accordance with policies of the Director.

Other CIA administrative functions compare with Army as indicated below:

<u>ARMY</u>	<u>CIA</u>
G-1 - (Personnel)	Personnel Director (Exec.)
G-4 - (Supply & Transportation)	Services Division (Exec.)
Comptroller - (Budget & Finance; Mgmt)	Budget & Fiscal Divisions (Exec.)
	.. Management Staff (Exec.)
Surgeon General	Medical Staff (Exec.)

~~RESTRICTED~~

~~RESTRICTED~~

<u>ARMY</u>	<u>CIA</u>
G-2 - (Security only) .....	Inspection & Security Staff
Inspector General .....	" " "
Judge Advocate General .....	Legal Staff
G-1 and G-3 (Tables of Org. only) .....	Management Staff (Exec.)
G-2 (Normal Intelligence Function) .....	No specific counterpart other than the entire Agency which is, in effect, G-2 for the U.S. Government.
G-3 (Plans and Operations) .....	No specific counterpart. COAPS had been intended for that function, but has never been effectively operative.

There is no exact means of comparison between CIA and the military establishment. As nearly as it can be compared, however, it is broadly something like this at present:

<u>ARMY</u>	<u>CIA</u>
Chief of Staff .....	Director
Vice Chief of Staff .....	Deputy Director
Deputy Chief of Staff (Operations) .....	Deputy Director
<u>G-2</u>	Offices of CIA: (OSO OO ) (OPC OGD) (ORE OSI)
<u>G-3</u>	<u>Advisory Council</u> <u>COAPS</u> <u>I&amp;S Staff</u> <u>General Counsel</u>
Deputy Chief of Staff (Admin.) .....	Executive
<u>G-1</u> (Special & Technical	<u>Personnel</u>
<u>G-4</u> (Staffs are in general under	<u>Services</u> (Supply & Procurement)
(supervision of these General	<u>Budget &amp; Fiscal</u>
(Staff Divisions.	<u>Medical</u> <u>Management</u>

As a further analogy we might compare our Offices to Armies and our support facilities to a Theater Headquarters. As Chief of the Personnel Branch, G-1 Division, European Theater Headquarters, during World War II, I personally participated in the planning for both the OVERLORD assault and combat operations mounted thereafter. In each case my primary responsibility was to determine and state the extent to which desired operations could be supported by US personnel. I also had to have foreknowledge of operational plans some months in advance in order to provide War Department, G-1, with adequate information on which to base selective service calls for personnel for training in this country to meet anticipated needs some eight months later in combat zones. Among other items of

~~RESTRICTED~~

~~RESTRICTED~~

the most sensitive nature, I had foreknowledge of the D-Day date set for OVERLORD. However, I certainly had nothing to do with the control of the Armies. A considerable number of other individuals in G-1 and G-4 Divisions and in the Special and Technical Staffs were in similar support positions with access to essential advance information relative to planned operations, and we were all in constant coordination and collaboration in planning and supervising the implementation of plans to support operations.

At a later date, as G-1 of a large command, I had not only the personnel responsibility, but general supervisory responsibility over the following administrative staffs in support of operations:

Adjutant General  
Fiscal Officer  
Judge Advocate General  
Inspector General  
Claims Officer  
Special Services Officer (Includ. Army  
Exchange activities)  
Chaplain  
Surgeon

In this instance, as before, I necessarily had full advance knowledge of planned operations, and the responsibility for determining whether desired operations could be supported from the standpoint of my field of responsibility. But again, I had nothing to do with the control of the operating units of the command.

I have only used myself in the foregoing because of direct personal experience in connection with the type of problem with which we are faced. The example of the Adjutant General used in the OPC memorandum does not in any way fit our situation, and the comparison with the Army general and special staff organization is not supported by actual facts.

This is intended only for informal data for your information and not for the purpose of starting a paper war with OPC.

As a (perhaps irrelevant) comment, I should like to add that "Restricted" would probably be an adequate classification for the attached document.

  
L.T.S.

~~RESTRICTED~~